

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

CHAD HAEFNER,

Plaintiff

v.

CHARLES DANIELS, et. al.,

Defendants

Case No. 2:21-cv-01564-JAD-VCF

**Order Dismissing
and Closing Case**

On August 23, 2021, I ordered Plaintiff Chad Haefner to either pay the filing fee or file a complete *in forma pauperis* application by October 20, 2021.¹ That deadline expired without an application or payment of the filing fee, so I dismiss and close this case.

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal” of a case.² A court may dismiss an action based on a party’s failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules.³ In determining whether to dismiss an action on one of these grounds, the court must consider: (1) the public’s interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court’s need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the

¹ ECF No. 1 at 8.

² *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986).


³ See *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53–54 (9th Cir. 1995) (dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260–61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440–41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

1 defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the
2 availability of less drastic alternatives.⁴

3 The first two factors, the public's interest in expeditiously resolving this litigation and the
4 court's interest in managing its docket, weigh in favor of dismissal of the plaintiff's claims. The
5 third factor, risk of prejudice to defendants, also weighs in favor of dismissal because a
6 presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in filing a pleading
7 ordered by the court or prosecuting an action.⁵ A court's warning to a party that its failure to
8 obey the court's order will result in dismissal satisfies the fifth factor's "consideration of
9 alternatives" requirement,⁶ and that warning was given here.⁷ The fourth factor—the public
10 policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits—is greatly outweighed by the factors
11 favoring dismissal.

12 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that **THIS ACTION IS DISMISSED** without prejudice
13 based on the plaintiff's failure to file a complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis* or pay
14 the filing fee as ordered. The Clerk of Court is directed to **ENTER JUDGMENT** accordingly
15 and **CLOSE THIS CASE. No other documents may be filed in this now-closed case.** If
16 Haefner wishes to pursue his claims, he must file a complaint in a new case, and he must either
17 pay the filing fee or file a complete *in forma pauperis* application in that new case.

18 Dated: October 21, 2021

19 
20 U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey

21 ⁴ *Thompson*, 782 F.2d at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423–24; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 130;
22 *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260–61; *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53.

⁵ See *Anderson v. Air West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976).

23 ⁶ *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132–33; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1424.

⁷ ECF No. 1 at 8.